



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The priest was like one mad. He made as if he would close in upon him and chastise him; but Phil was a powerful fellow, and not to be trifled with. He stood on his guard firmly, but not disrespectfully, and so went on—

"It's but a cabin, sir, and a patch of ground; and the longest possession a man can have of it is but a few years. And in case he don't get it, there's scores of places just as good to the fore; or, if he's turned out, he needn't want a shelter to go to. But the place that we're depending on your reverence to engage for us when we leave this world—"

Here the priest interrupted him with a worse word than I would like to write down; and turning to us, he said—

"Boys, will you see your priest insulted by a swaddling apostate, that sold himself to the devil and the Bible-men for a few coin? My curse on ye if ye don't stop his blasphemous mouth, and drive him out!"

"They needn't," says Phil, looking coolly at us; "I'm not going to trouble your reverence any further, as I've insensed you into my meaning about the everlasting habitation. I meant you no disrespect, sir; but a poor man's soul is precious; and I must have better warrant than the bare word of any living man before I hazard it for ever."—*American Paper.*

#### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

*The great length of Mr. Power's letter has obliged us to postpone Mr. Rourke's till our next. Our reasons for not publishing the communication headed "Talk of the Wall," have been already stated in our May number.*

*We have again to apologize to several of our friends for postponing their valued communications. If our correspondents would recollect the limited space of our columns, when forwarding letters or articles, it would prevent much embarrassment and disappointment.*

*We beg to call the attention of our correspondents to the utility of adding their name and address to their communications.*

*To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.*

*All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st. Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.*

## The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, NOVEMBER, 1854.

WE have been so little in the habit of boasting of what we have done in the field of controversy, that it is very probable many of our most constant readers are actually ignorant, even at the present time (though our periodical has now been in existence nearly three years), to what extent its columns have been circulated, and read throughout the British dominions. The official returns made by the Revenue department, and recently published, of the number of stamps issued to the several newspapers in this city, have, however, made public the *enormity* of our proceedings; and we were somewhat amused a short time since by a story told us by a warm friend, of a worthy man, sincerely anxious for the success of Protestant missions in this country, but apparently wholly ignorant of the existence or nature of our paper, who confessed to him that he had been greatly discouraged by seeing, from the public returns, the increased circulation of a "Popish" paper, called the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN*, which, within the preceding twelve months, had actually risen to an annual issue of 120,000 copies! As it is useless to deny that our misdemeanours really amount to that formidable number, we must only hope that our numerous readers will rejoice to find that they have so many to sympathize with them, and that they will cordially aid our efforts to make our circulation still greater, so as to bring it within the reach of all who are able and willing to use the reason which God has graciously bestowed on them, in "proving all things, and holding fast that which is good." Nor can we help feeling gratified by the numerous encouraging letters which reach us from various quarters, expressive of cordial approbation of the tone and spirit of our paper. We also think it right to acknowledge the flattering allusion to our labours, made by

an ably-conducted contemporary, the *Irish Church Journal*, in a recent number, couched in terms of praise, which, though they may exceed our merits, certainly but justly describe what we would earnestly *desire* to become, if in our power. We trust none of our readers will attribute our citing it to mere vanity or a spirit of boasting, which we hope we have never indulged in, but rather to a sincere desire to encourage our readers, by showing them that their partiality for our columns is participated in by others well qualified to judge of the object we have in view, and our mode of attempting to effect it.

"Let that admirable periodical, the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN*," says our respected contemporary, "which has already done so much good, in the most solid, but least obtrusive form, be generously supported, and the sphere of its operations extended on all sides. It reaches the minds that lead others. It exercises an influence not only on the middle classes, the shopkeepers, and more intelligent farmers—but upon the priests themselves. It is a missionary whose advent provokes no riots, and brings about no breach of the peace—a missionary who can be present with the same talent, learning, good taste, and wisdom, at the same time in every house in Ireland—a missionary who runs no risk of broken bones himself, and whom every man may listen to without compromising his position in society, or drawing upon himself the universal notice of his neighbours."

Should the above passage meet the eye of the worthy friend of Irish Protestant Missions, above referred to, we hope it will go far to reconcile him to the idea which so grievously alarmed him when he discovered that the circulation of the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN*, within the last twelve months, amounted to 120,000 copies. Our appeals he will find are all to the reason, and never to the passions of our readers, either Roman Catholic or Protestant; and, therefore, afford, we hope, some prospect of ultimately leading men to the truth. We have good reason, also, to believe, that the *Irish Church Journal* is not far wrong in the allusion made in the passage cited to the Roman Catholic priesthood, and that no inconsiderable number of the priests in this country are among our regular readers. It would be too much to suppose that the majority of them are friendly to our exertions, or that they do not still look upon our pages with a somewhat jaundiced eye, as calculated to exercise an injurious effect upon their own interests. Some, however, we sincerely believe, are capable of taking a higher and more noble-minded view of the matter, and would willingly (or even, like the worthy Dutch priest described in another column, gladly) see a reformation in the Church of which they are members, did they not fear that a disclosure of their wishes might subject them to the wrath of their ecclesiastical superiors, and tend to their personal ruin. We confess it ever gives us pain to think that even the transition from the most fatal error to the most glorious truth should injure, even in a temporal point of view, the welfare of any one, whether priest or layman; and we would gladly see the same happy result again, which has, in some instances, we believe, already occurred, even in this country, of the priest and his flock *simultaneously* repudiating the errors of a Church which has long arrogantly claimed to be "the mother and mistress of all Churches," without being able to give any rational proof to satisfy an unprejudiced inquiring mind, that she really deserves that title. It is cheering, however, to learn, as we read in a letter from Monsieur ERNEST VENT, pastor at Brussels, dated 5th October, 1854, published in the same periodical above referred to, that Roman Catholic priests, who have the courage, like the Abbe MIEL (whose interesting letter we printed in our last number), to follow their conscientious convictions, by renouncing the Church of Rome, are not always, even in that eminently Romish country, Belgium, pecuniary sufferers by their change.

"Until 1839," writes Monsieur Vent, "there were in Brussels only two Anglican Churches, and the French and German Church, which latter consists of about 3,000 Pro-

testants. In that year, pastor Von Maerdyck, formerly a Roman Catholic priest, opened a Flemish Church. At first, there were but thirty or forty hearers. Last year, the Flemish congregation numbered more than fifteen hundred, of whom more than twelve hundred were converts. This congregation has become so settled, and is progressing so regularly, that the government could not help allotting a salary to its pastor, three months ago. Thus, this Church is now publicly acknowledged, and forms but one with the French and German one. M. Von Maerdyck has, during the whole year, two religious lectures in two different parts of the city, for adult Romanists—these lectures are attended by from sixty to seventy persons."

We are not altogether without hope that we may yet live to see the day when similar results may not be uncommon in our own beloved country. Be that as it may, however, we are determined to do our part, under the Divine blessing, and leave the result to God. Will not our readers assist us in this devout wish, by circulating our pages, if they approve of them, by every means in their power?

#### RECENT CONTROVERSY AT BOULOGNE.

(Continued from page 124.)

Dr. M.—It is not the fact that the Church has always interpreted the passage, "Thou art Peter," &c., in the manner you state. We have distinct proof of this in the reason assigned for giving the Bishop of Rome a primacy of place—namely, the rank of his metropolitan city; that, and not the passage "thou art Peter," &c., was the foundation of the precedence of place allowed to him. But I must ask you to remember your own assertion, that these words conferred both infallibility and jurisdiction over the whole Church, upon St. Peter, and the Roman Pontiffs. Produce, therefore, if you please the decree of the early Church giving that passage.

Mr. G.—The great Council of Nice, held in the year 325, declared that the Church of Rome always had the primacy and jurisdiction over the whole Church.

Dr. M.—No such decree was made. The Roman legate, at the subsequent Synod of Sardica, referred to a canon of the Council of Nice, and, when quoting it, interpolated the words you mention. Reference was made to the genuine canons, when this addition was convicted, and rejected. Again, I must ask you what even this has to do with infallibility? Why do you not produce a decree of the Church, if any such really exist, on this head? If the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff or Church, was recognised is it not strange that we do not find it either urged or submitted to, which, if true, it assuredly would be, as the effectual means of checking or ending the multitudinous disputes which distracted the early Church. Not only is this not the case, but we have decisive testimony to the reverse. This infallible interposition was not only not exerted, but decisions of the Roman Bishop were even disbelieved. Take, for instance, the memorable Donatist schism, when the Emperor commanded the Roman Pontiff (with whom he associated other bishops) to examine the matter. The Donatist bishops refused submission to this Pontiff's decision when adverse to them, alleging, as a reason for so doing, that the judgment of a few western bishops—the Pope being one of them—should not be weighed against that of so many Numidian ones. Now, is it credible, that such a plea as this could have been made—and it appears, moreover, to have been allowed—if the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff or Church had been then a recognised doctrine? With respect to the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, I just wish to ascertain what you understand by it; has the Pope supreme power in temporal as well as in spiritual matters?

Mr. G.—In both; he has a direct and supreme authority in spiritual things; but, since you cannot separate these from temporal, he has, indirectly, jurisdiction over the latter also.

Dr. M.—I ask the question because, whatever claim you make, it is *that* and not something else which you must prove. Is there any doctrine of your Church on the subject, or is it not true that here, as in other most important matters, there is a variety of opinion? Thus, on the one side, Pope Innocent III. claims express temporal jurisdiction over kings—God, said he made two great lights, the greater to rule the day, &c., these are, said he, the papal and the regal; the former superior to the latter.

Mr. G.—I never heard that illustration before; it is beautiful, and quite expresses the truth.

Dr. M.—Well, let us see, here are Cardinal Wiseman's words directly contradicting the Pope—"There is nothing taught in the Catholic Church on the subject; it is no principle of her belief whatsoever, that the Pope does possess, or can possess, any temporal power, and that if we speak of those kingdoms which are not in anywise connected with his temporal government, it

\* For this reason, the Bishop of Rome must long since be disentitled even to this primacy of place.

is the belief of all Catholics that the Pope has not the slightest jurisdiction or right to interfere upon earth"—"Lectures on the Church," p. 170

Mr. Langdon.—I shall proceed to show the doctrine from the Scripture. Walking one day in Galilee with His disciples he halted and said to them:—

"Whom do men say that I am? And the disciples answered: Some say that thou art John the Baptist, and others Elias, and others Jesus, or one of the prophets. He then said to them: But whom do you say that I am? Simon Peter, answering, said: Thou art Christ the Son of the living God. And Jesus, answering, said to him: Blessed art thou Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee but my Father who is in heaven. And I say unto thee: Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth it shall be loosed also in heaven." And at the last supper, suddenly turning towards Peter, He said to him: Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for THEE that THY FAITH FAIL NOT: and thou being once converted, CONFIRM THY BRETHREN." + After His resurrection, Jesus one day said to Peter: Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these? Peter answered: Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus said to him: feed my lambs. He said to him again: Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? He answered: Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus said to him: feed my sheep. t

"In virtue of these words addressed to him by Christ, Peter exercised his apostolic prerogative on the following among other occasions.

"In the Cenacle—Acts, chap. 1st, v. 15 and following.

"On the day of Pentecost—Acts, chap. 2nd, v. 14 and preceding and following verses.

"The first miracle wrought by him—Acts, chap. 3rd, v. 6, 12, and following.

"Addresses the princes, ancients and scribes in answer to the question, by what power they taught. &c.—Acts, chap. 4th, v. 8th and following.

"Judges Ananias and Sapphira, and executes judgment upon them—Acts, chap. 5th, v. 3rd, and following.

"Visits the Churches—Acts, chap. 9th, v. 32 and following.

"Cornelius sent to him by the Spirit of God—Acts, chap. 10th, v. 5th and 6th.

"First invites the nations to the Faith—Acts, chap. 11th, v. 84th and following.

"And, to sum up all, he is always put forward most prominently in the Scriptures much oftener than, and in a manner quite different from, any other apostle." §

Dr. M.—Now, Mr. Langdon, remember what you have undertaken to prove by these passages—jurisdiction over the whole Church of Christ, in the sense of power to be submitted to, given to St. Peter and to his successors. You have read, it is true, a number of passages, now interpret them, and prove their meaning to convey that doctrine which you want us to believe. But here you are again met by the insurmountable difficulty which meets you everywhere, when you attempt any argument from the Scriptures. What is the principle of interpretation which you employ? Are you going to use your own judgment for the explanation? Then, why do you so peremptorily prohibit a like use of it for Protestants? Whatever objections you make against it must (try to evade the fact as you will) recoil in full force on yourselves. It is impossible for either Roman Catholics or Protestants to avoid exercising their own judgments upon the Scriptures—you must do it, and cannot help it. Are you about to use the infallibility of the Church as the warrant for your interpretation? This you cannot here do; you cannot assume what you are called on to prove. Are you going to assert the unanimous consent of the fathers? Then give me the proof that it did really assign to the passages you adduce that meaning, and none other, which you now assign to them; produce explicit declarations to this effect. The question is one of simple fact, to be established by an appeal to history.

Mr. L.—I am not arguing for heretics! but for a Catholic lady who has eyes in her soul, || and can understand truth. No one but a Catholic can perceive Catholic doctrine.

Mr. G.—A Catholic writer reckons up the number of times wherein mention is made of St. Peter, more than of any other Apostle; the proportion is very great indeed.

Dr. M.—Suppose we grant it all, the fact is unavailing, unless he or you prove, in addition, that each occasion of mention establishes the present doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. If you use the fact you speak of as an argument, you are clearly bound to show the reason of mention in all these cases to be the distinct declaration of your modern doctrine. It is easy enough, I think, to show, that while some of them establish the reverse, not

one of them proves your case. Here is your perpetual device and sophism; you assert one thing, and prove something utterly different, which you hope may be mistaken for it. Why do you not keep to the point at issue? Prove what you assert, and prove nothing else. Can anything be more weak than Mr. Langdon's attempt? It is simply to read a number of passages, wherein Peter is mentioned, and then assert, without any proof, that they establish a jurisdiction of power to have been committed to that Apostle and to the Roman Pontiffs. That Peter had a primacy of place is not even made out by them; that he had a primacy of power over the whole Church is, I think, refuted by the best possible testimony—the history of the transactions of the Church—while he was yet alive and exercising all the functions of his office.

Take, for instance, one of the cases, mentioned by Mr. Langdon—Peter's visit to Cornelius—Upon his return, he was called to account for acting as he had done—"Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and did eat with them." Is this a mode of address likely to be used by those who admitted his jurisdiction as an acknowledged fact? Does his reply make a claim or even a reference to such authority? No such thing; his defence is, he remembered the words of the Lord foretelling this reception of the gentiles unto the Church, and then adds, "what was I that I could withstand God." So far, then, as this passage adduced by Mr. Langdon bears on the question, it gives a double evidence—that of Peter and his accusers—against the doctrine he desires to establish by it. That the Apostle should, in this summary way, be called on to defend his act, is inconsistent with the idea that the Church admitted him to have supreme jurisdiction, while the manner in which he makes that defence, proves he had no idea of it himself.

With respect to another of the passages just quoted—"I will give to thee," &c.—did it convey this supreme jurisdiction and infallibility to St. Peter?

Mr. L.—Certainly.

Dr. M.—Bellarmine has found a considerable difficulty where you see none. If infallibility be conveyed here to St. Peter, how does it occur that shortly after he denied the Lord? He was not, surely, infallible then, and, therefore not before the act of denial. Now, though Roman Catholics very commonly press this whole passage as the great proof of this Apostle's infallibility, yet it is clear, that Cardinal Bellarmine felt it would not do to say this without some qualification. He felt the difficulty I have mentioned; and asserts, accordingly, that the words, "Thou art Peter," &c., did not convey infallibility, but only promised it, the conveyance being through a subsequent address—"Feed my sheep," &c.

Short of express passages, absolutely condemning and rejecting the alleged prerogatives of Peter (which cannot be found, simply because the claim itself was an usurpation introduced in times long subsequent), we have as strong evidence as it seems probable to have that no such thing existed; circumstances, of which we have the account, occurred, which must have drawn it out, had it been true; statements are made absolutely inconsistent with it. Let us take the case of St. Paul, the same who declares that he did not build on another man's foundation. He must, beyond all doubt, have usurped Peter's asserted prerogatives (if such existed) when he asserts that on him, not on Peter, was "the care of all the Churches." He does more, since he limits expressly this Apostle's superintendence in Church matters; for he terms him, by way of distinction from himself and restriction, "the minister of the circumcision," while he claims for himself the wider province over the gentile Church. He speaks, moreover, of such distinction and limitation as a thing admitted and acknowledged in the Church, "when they"—i.e., the heads of the Church at Jerusalem—"saw that the Gospel of the uncircumcision was committed to me, as the Gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter," &c. Here is a division of superintendence distinctly asserted and allowed: the limitation of the smaller portion to Peter; the reservation of far the larger part of the gentile Church (under which, be it well remembered, the Church of Rome itself was included) to Paul. How can this be reconciled with the alleged claim of (made for, not by) Peter to undivided jurisdiction over the whole Church. Is it not absolutely inconsistent with it? And in strict accordance with his own extent of jurisdiction, St. Paul addresses his epistle to the Church at Rome, expressly asserting as his reason for doing so, the fact, that the whole gentile Church was his province. "I am debtor," he says—that is, I am bound by the duty consequent upon this province to preach—to the gentiles. So—because the Church of Rome was a gentile Church—I am ready to preach the Gospel to you that are at Rome also." Here the principle which refutes your doctrine is clearly laid down. But there is also an especial instance personal to these Apostles which again contradicts it.

St. Paul says—"When Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face," &c.

Mr. G.—We consider that to be a great proof of St. Peter's humility, he submitted to rebuke from an inferior. The fact also that St. Paul mentions him so especially proves his peculiar dignity.

Dr. M.—You will, I think, find it difficult to adapt what you say to the recorded facts of the case. I am afraid the whole transaction will press as severely against the infallibility of Peter as it does against his supreme

jurisdiction. The charge which Paul makes against him is expressly this—that, by his conduct, he was giving encouragement to the false doctrine which the Judaizing teachers disseminated in the Galatian Church. This doctrine was one which Paul incessantly opposed as contradictory to the truth of the Gospel. St. Peter, by his example, gave strength and countenance to the great error, that observance of the Mosaic law by gentile converts was essential for their salvation. This Paul everywhere opposed; and he opposed Peter for sanctioning it. It was no "mere act of imprudence" which he condemned, it was a grievous error. St. Peter's humility had a deeper foundation than the frivolous one you assign. It was from the consciousness of having strengthened a grievous error to the great detriment of truth. And the peculiar mention of him, which you say proves his peculiar dignity, is declared to arise from the simple fact, that he "had come to Antioch."

It is certainly very strange if Peter be, as you assert, the only infallible Apostle, that he alone should be mentioned, after the day of Pentecost, as the only fallible one. Does it not seem as if distinct provision was here made against the modern allocation to him of any such prerogative? Before the day of Pentecost he denied Christ, though it had been said of him, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven."\* After the day of Pentecost, he alone of the Apostles is found on the side of error. How does actual special fallibility accord with presumed especial infallibility? Again we are informed (Acts viii. 14), "When the Apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaritans had received the Word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John."

Mr. G.—There is no force in that. The prelates of the Church may, on some important matter, meet and request the Pontiff to go and settle it in person. His supremacy would not be affected by this.

Dr. M.—I am very sure if they did, which is unlikely, they would not record the act in these words, "they sent" the Pope. The expression would surely have been more deferential. I use the passage, however, simply as an indication that the doctrine of Peter's primacy of power was then unknown, as I use, for the same purpose, these other statements which appear to repel the supposition that Peter was believed to be elevated, as you would have him to be. "James, Cephas—i.e., Peter—and John who seemed to be pillars." If Peter was known to be supreme in jurisdiction, would he be spoken of along with others as seeming to be pillars; or, if the Corinthian Church knew of such doctrine, would they have literally gone against it, as they did when one of them was "of Paul," another "of Apollos," another "of Cephas." No such doctrine, it is plain, was heard of at Corinth.

There remains another proof to which I beg to direct your attention, for it appears to me very decisive, Acts xx. 26, &c.† Here you will observe St. Paul is warning the elders of the Ephesian Church, that certain errors would creep in—that, of their own selves, "men would arise speaking perverse things," and "seeking to draw away disciples." Now, is it possible to conceive that St. Paul, if he knew the doctrine of Peter's infallibility or of the Church's—which, if either existed, he must have known—would, upon the very occasion where it is most essential he should assert it as a decisive preventive of those very evils which it was most essential to prevent, not only omit all mention of it, but state instead and enforce other preventives. For he says—"Therefore watch, and remember," &c. He points out evils which he apprehended as certain; those evils were erroneous doctrine and schism. Infallibility, and jurisdiction of power in a particular person or Church, if acknowledged, would have stopped both, by extinguishing the right to think at all. How is it possible to account for St. Paul's omitting to mention them, under circumstances which were exactly those requiring their mention, unless the true explanation of his silence was, that he knew nothing of them.

The following extract is taken from the *Resumé* as the answer given by Mr. Gretton to this argument:—

"That nothing of so negative a nature could be adduced as proof. That great existing facts are often passed by in silence by contemporary writers as too well known to require mention. That in extracting doctrines from the Bible, it was always necessary to compare one part with another. That if the Doctor's line of argument held good hardly any doctrines could be proved by the Bible. That in the 'whole counsel of God,' preached by St. Paul, no doubt entered the necessity of submission to one visible head of one visible body, as the only means of preserving unity, and this the experience of nineteen centuries had victoriously proved, for it is a well-known and

\* Whenever and in whatever particular case the Holy Spirit was the teacher there, of course, was truth taught and uttered. The force of the argument is to show that infallibility was not attached (according to the Roman Catholic doctrine) as a permanent gift to the person of Peter, and, therefore, not to his imaginary successors.

† For this argument I am indebted to a sermon, preached by his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, on this passage, from the Acts. It is so decisive, that I see no possibility of answering it, except in one way, and that is, by supposing the *doctrine of development* to have extended to St. Paul. It would not in the least surprise me to hear this asserted yet; for, as there has been introduced "a development of doctrine," so the doctrine of development may itself be developed. The principle applied to itself will produce it. An intelligent Roman Catholic controversialist, Dr. P. Murray, of Maynooth, after some time, undertook an elaborate answer to his Grace's sermon—(see CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. i., p. 101). The inference from this reply appears inevitably to be this—that the argument cannot be refuted, except by the fatal admission, that infallibility is not at all necessary for the perpetration of Divine truth.

\* St. Matthew, xvi. 13.

† St. Luke, xxii. 32, 32.

‡ St. John, xxiv. 15 and following.

§ The passages in small type are taken verbatim from the *Resumé*.

|| Coupling this with Mr. Langdon's previous statement about "instinct," it appears that this gentleman came much nearer to heresy than became his determined orthodoxy. Condemning the exercise of judgment, however well regulated and directed, he yet approves of "instinct" as an argument, and gives "eyes of the soul" to Catholics. Thus he is in hazardous proximity to the old extravagances of Methodism, to Quakerism, and to some of the ancient Gnostic modes of defending their deadly errors. So true is it that "extremes meet."

avowed fact that out of the Catholic Church there is no visible unity."—*Resumé*, page 14.

Dr. M.—The silence of Scripture respecting any doctrine is a decisive argument against its truth. Contemporary historians would scarcely omit, if writing for posterity, facts of prime importance, as being too well known to be mentioned. But your parallel *assumes* the fact which is wholly denied—namely, that infallibility and primacy were known *at all*. There is very decisive evidence afforded by Mr. Newman's doctrine of *development*, that all early history is against you; for it is a plain declaration on his part, that the doctrines of the Church of Rome, as *they now exist*, cannot be found in the records of the early Church. Their germs only are, on this theory, to be found either in the Bible or in such records. These were subsequently to be expanded or *developed*. This settles your assertion that the facts were *too well known to be mentioned*; for it *admits* that the present doctrines of your Church were not known at all. Moreover, would not that historian be judged unfaithful, who, when writing for future ages, should omit most important facts which they could not know except through history. Acting thus, although the circumstance which he was describing called expressly for mention of such facts, still more would he be to be reprehended were he, though aware of their importance to futurity, not only to suppress but apparently to supplant them by other statements very difficult to be reconciled with them.

Nothing can be safer than your rule—"In extracting doctrines from the Bible it was *always necessary* to compare one part with another." It is precisely because such comparison of passages, as well as the separate examination of each, negatives your *peculiar* doctrines that we, Protestants, reject them.

You say, "that in the whole counsel of God, preached by St. Paul, *no doubt entered the necessity* of submission to *one* visible head &c. This is, of course, a mere assertion, plainly without a shadow of proof. Nay, more, it is not only irreconcileable with the *systematic* silence of Paul in *all* his epistles, but against the clear witness of those several instances where he makes express mention of Peter. He wrote fourteen epistles. He treated of discipline, and delivered doctrine. He is, in every case, silent on the infallibility and supreme jurisdiction of the Church or Peter, though the circumstances which he mentions were just the fitting occasions to enforce these doctrines, *if they were true*."

The beloved Apostle, St. John, is another witness against you. He lived until the end of the first century, presiding over the seven Asiatic Churches. During his lifetime there were several succeeding Roman bishops. If your imagined prerogatives of St. Peter were transmitted to imagined successors in the See of Rome, it would follow that the inspired Apostle, John, must have been inferior in spiritual privileges, and subordinate in authority to successive bishops of Rome.

Mr. G.—So he was.\*

Dr. M.—Now, you directly contradict the Scriptures, which declare, "God hath set some in the Church. *First* Apostles (1 Cor. xii. 28), secondarily, &c." Here it is very clear from the context, that "first" includes foremost in dignity. This could not be if, as you say, St. John, though an Apostle, was subordinate to the bishops of Rome, who were successively his contemporaries, and who were not Apostles.

(To be continued.)

### Correspondence.

#### IS THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND SCHISMATICAL?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Carlow, October 29, 1854.

SIR—I take the liberty of resuming a correspondence that I had with you last August, on the title "Catholic." In answer to your strictures on my last letter, you say, that "the Irish Protestant Church does not owe its existence to any act of separation, which has never committed any act of schism;" and you say this is the Church to which Christians of this country ought to belong.

If I am to understand, by the foregoing, that the present Protestant Church of Ireland is identical with the Church of Ireland four hundred years ago, I am wonderfully deceived. In the first place, what is a separation, but simply a change of belief from one set of opinions to that of another, and I call this a separation, more or less, according to the nature of opinions changed; to use a military phrase, you have circumscribed our field of action, therefore the fight will be more decisive.

In Bede's *Eccles. Hist.*, bib. 1st., you will find that Celsine, Pope of Rome, sent Palladius to convert the Irish, and afterwards St. Patrick.—See, also, St. Prosper, Chron. St. Columbanus calls the Pope his master, the steersman, the mystic pilot.

The ancient monasteries, and the remains of other holy buildings, with their crumbling altars, holy water fonts,

stone crosses, the chalices of ancient times yet in the land, and the remains of other church plate with monkish devices thereon, fairly indicate, beyond a shadow of doubt, that they belong to another and different religion to the one now occupying the land, having the title "Irish Protestant Church, or Church of England and Ireland." St. Bridget and her abbeys, her religious houses, and virgins of her pious order—where are her followers to be seen in the Protestant Church of England and Ireland? Where? Oh, yes, I could multiply testimony on testimony of the non-existence of this new and alien Church, from this fertile land of Catholic antiquity; and oh, I could trace the changes of religion, aye, painfully too, and as true as it is painful. When Patrick became our island saint, it was with crozier in hand, with a halo round his path, and a blessing marked his footsteps, and he onward came, the apostle of peace, an image of his Heavenly Master, and he evangelized the land. Thenceforward Ireland became like Rome in Paul's days; their faith and piety, and learning, were spoken of throughout the world.

We can learn from ancient historians and their contemporaries that Ireland, from Patrick to the British rule, kept up a faithful and submissive chain of correspondence with the Pontiff at Rome. In my next letter, please God, if you will, I shall enter more largely and in detail, peering my way, by strict, undeniable, historical information, that will leave a reasonable impression on the minds of your readers that I have not begun this correspondence empty-handed as regards "proof positive" of the justness of my cause.

I am, dear sir, yours respectfully,

A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

Our correspondent appears to us to confound the obvious distinction between "opinions" and "actions." We admit, that at the Reformation, the Church of Ireland changed many erroneous opinions; we deny that it committed any act of separation or schism. Our correspondent thinks that he disproves this statement by saying, that, at the time of the Reformation, the Irish Church did alter some of its opinions. But this is no contradiction to what we said; as far as it goes, it exactly agrees with what we said. If our correspondent wants to contradict what we said, he must show what act of separation or of schism the Irish Church committed at the time of the Reformation. This he does not attempt to do; and we are justified in supposing that he does not attempt to point to any act of the kind, simply because he can find no act of the kind to point to. We feel sure that if our correspondent could point out any act of separation or schism committed by the Church of Ireland, on any particular day, or in any particular place, he would not fail to do so. Until he can point out such an act, it is useless for him to affirm that such acts have been committed.

All he attempts to do is to affirm that, *in his opinion*, every change of opinion is an act of separation. With the history of the Church before us, we think such an opinion quite untenable. We recommend our correspondent to change that opinion at once; and in doing so, he will find, by his own personal experience, that changing an opinion does not necessarily involve any act of separation. Surely he can change this untenable opinion without separating from any body. If other people separate from him because he changes it, the act of separation will be committed by them, and not by him. This was precisely the case of the Irish Church at the Reformation. She changed some erroneous opinions; and for that the Bishop of Rome separated from her, and persuaded as many as he could to do the same; but she committed no act of separation. If she did, let our correspondent point out the when, and where, and how.

In the third century, St. Cyprian and the African Church held a totally opposite opinion to Pope Stephen and the Church of Rome, in a matter which the Council of Trent treats as a question of faith—viz., the rebaptizing of heretics. Does our correspondent mean to say that St. Cyprian and the African Church at that time committed any act of separation from the communion of the Church of Rome? All history is against such a notion.

Under the guidance of St. Augustine, the African Church altered that erroneous opinion, and adopted another, opposed to St. Cyprian, and equally opposed to Pope Stephen. The whole Church has since adopted the opinion of St. Augustine. Does our correspondent mean to say that the Church of Africa, by correcting that error, did separate from herself or from any other? If he think so, let him say it. But if he feel, as he must, that such an assertion would be false and absurd, with what truth or reason can he say that every change of opinion or belief must needs be an act of separation?

We will give him one instance more. Respecting the Immaculate Conception, Bishop Milner says—"The Church does not decide the controversy concerning the conception of the Blessed Virgin, and several other disputed points, because she sees nothing absolutely clear and certain concerning them, either in the written or the unwritten Word."—End of Controversy, letter xii. The present Pope, Pius IX., has confirmed this in his letter of February 2, 1849, in which he distinctly admits, that "this honour has not yet been decreed to the most Holy Virgin by the Church and the Apostolic See." It is clear, therefore,

that, up to the present time, the Church of Rome has been of opinion that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, whether true or false, is not an article of the Christian faith which all men are bound to believe. But the Church of Rome is now going to *change this opinion*. On the 8th day of December next, the Church of Rome will decide that this doctrine is an article of the Christian faith, which all are bound to believe. Now, when the Church of Rome shall have thus changed her opinion about no less a question than whether a certain doctrine be an article of the Christian faith or no, will our correspondent then be ready to say that the Church of Rome of December will have separated from the Church of Rome of November? We think the Church of Rome will have changed its opinion for the worse, and will have still further corrupted the Catholic faith; but we do not see that any act of separation will be thereby committed, or will necessarily follow; although we are quite clear that if any members of the Church of Rome should thereupon separate from her, on the ground that she had corrupted the faith, they would be quite justified in doing so.

We hope our correspondent now understands the difference between altering an opinion and committing an act of separation. Actions may follow from opinions; but it does not therefore follow that opinions are actions. An act of separation may follow from a change of opinion, or it may not. To say that a Church has changed some opinions, can never be a proof that that Church has committed an act of separation, *until* that act of separation can be pointed out. Let our correspondent, therefore, show us *when, and where, and how*, the Irish Church derived its existence from an act of separation or schism, or ever committed such an act?

Our correspondent says, at the end of his letter—"That Ireland, from Patrick to the British rule, kept up a faithful and submissive chain of correspondence with the Pontiff at Rome." Now, it is our opinion that if our correspondent was at all acquainted with ancient Irish Church history, he would never have ventured on so rash an opinion as this. However, as he promises to write to us again upon this subject, we will keep our observations upon that point till we hear from him again. And we hope he will not fail to perform that promise.

### ON PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—If it be allowed to notice some of your leading arguments against the doctrine of Purgatory, I shall, in the first instance, respectfully direct attention to CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. i., p. 81, where, with respect to "W. C. Search," quoting Tertullian, you say—"We are surprised he should venture to do so." Again—"Now, the fact is, that both the passages which 'W. C. S.' quotes from Tertullian, are both taken from books written after he became a Montanist and a heretic!" Then, you ask—"Is it not strange that men who call themselves Catholics should turn away from what Tertullian believed while he was yet a Catholic, and preach to us only the *deadly heresies* he fell into after he had left the Catholic Church?" Again, you pointedly ask—"Why do they (Catholics) not quote to us Mahomet and the Koran?" Your opinion, thus dogmatically expressed, decides the character of these two books of Tertullian; they are thus declared by your *fiat*, to contain only the heretical and impious doctrines of Montanus; yet, immediately after, you tell us—"the first passage (*De Corona Militis*, p. 209) speaks only of offering for the dead;" thence, we are to conclude from your own arguments, that offering for the dead is a part of the heresy of Montanus. With respect to the passage I have referred to, I perceive that you and Mr. Collette are in the antipodes of opinion; but, in your charge on Purgatory, perfectly unanimous. In CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. iii., p. 86, Mr. Collette says—"Tertullian speaks of a custom then existing in the Church among some Christians." In page 87, he admits, that in this book, which you stigmatize as heretical, and no better authority than the Koran, and in the identical chapter from which "W. C. S." quotes, Tertullian has enumerated certain usages of the Church (not the impious heresies of Montanus), and among them oblations for the dead, on the anniversary days of their heavenly birth." This passage he further vindicates, and thus establishes its genuine character beyond exception, by collateral and corroborating passages from St. Cyprian's epistles; and, in doing so, he has evolved no mystery, enunciated no new principles, but only given us what is the teaching of the Catholic Church now, as well as in the days of St. Augustine; that prayers and sacrifice offered for the Apostles, martyrs, &c., and for all those whose lives are very good, acts out of thanksgiving; yet, from this principle, Mr. Collette undertakes to disprove the doctrine of Purgatory! And, in order to make this conclusion available to the end he proposes, he tells those for whose edification he writes, by an egregious mistake, no doubt, that, "according to the modern Roman doctrine, all the faithful—all those who die in the faith of Christ—go to Purgatory, before they can be in a fit condition to appear before God!" But the poor gentleman has been reckoning without his host. I wish he had informed us where and how and from whom he has learned this novel feature of modern Roman theology. In CATHOLIC LAYMAN, December, 1852, page 141, col. i., I observe you fell into a like mistake; you say, "whenever Roman

\* I am pretty sure it was Mr. Gretton who gave this answer, which is in strict harmony with, or rather a necessary consequence of the inheritance of St. Peter's asserted privileges; and is, therefore, because of its absurdity, a refutation of them. Mr. Langdon, on another occasion, replied to me—"We have one (the Bishop of Rome) just as good as St. Paul!"

\* For this letter, see the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. i., No. 1, January, 1852.